

**REMARKS**

In the non-final Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-8, 10, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by LAZARIDIS et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,464 B1); rejects claims 13 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by SAYLOR et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,661,340 B1); rejects claims 4 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by LAZARIDIS et al. or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over LAZARIDIS et al. in view of LEE et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,161,008); and rejects claim 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by LAZARIDIS et al. or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over LAZARIDIS et al. in view of SKIDMORE (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0036380). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.<sup>1</sup>

By way of the present amendment, Applicants cancel claim 5 without prejudice or disclaimer and amend claims 1 and 10 to improve form. Claims 1-4 and 6-14 are pending.

Pending claims 1-4 and 6-12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by LAZARIDIS et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

A proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 requires that a reference teach every aspect of the claimed invention. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present. See M.P.E.P. § 2131. LAZARIDIS et al. does not disclose or suggest the combination of features recited in Applicants' claims 1-4 and 6-12.

---

<sup>1</sup> As Applicants' remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicants' silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine reference, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicants that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicants reserve the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

For example, amended independent claim 1 recites a method for providing a notification to a preferred communication device of a plurality of communication devices associated with a user, wherein each of the communication devices can be designated as the preferred communication device. The method includes receiving, at a server, a notification from one of the communication devices indicating that incoming data has been received at the one communication device; transmitting the received notification to the preferred communication device, and receiving, at the server, a selection, made by the user, of another one of the communication devices for which notifications are to be transmitted to the preferred communication device. LAZARIDIS et al. does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, LAZARIDIS et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving, at the server, a selection, made by the user, of another one of the communication devices for which notifications are to be transmitted to the preferred communication device. This feature of amended claim 1 was previously presented in claim 5. The Examiner relies on column 5, lines 44-49, column 6, lines 14-37, and column 12, lines 17-31 of LAZARIDIS et al. as allegedly disclosing this feature (Office Action, pg. 3). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of LAZARIDIS et al.

At column 5, lines 44-49, LAZARIDIS et al. discloses:

Referring now to the drawings, FIG. 1 is an example system diagram showing the redirection of user data items (such as message A or C) from a user's office PC (host system) 10 to the user's mobile data communication device 24, where the redirector software 12 is operating at the user's PC.

This section of LAZARIDIS et al. discloses redirecting user data items from a user's office PC to the user's mobile data communication device. This section of LAZARIDIS et al. does not

disclose or suggest receiving, at the server, a selection, made by the user, of another one of the communication devices for which notifications are to be transmitted to the preferred communication device, as required by amended claim 1.

At column 6, lines 14-37, LAZARIDIS et al. discloses:

In the example of FIG. 1, a wireless gateway 20 is connected to the Internet for communicating via wireless link 22 to a plurality of wireless mobile data communication devices 24. Also shown in FIG. 1 is machine 30, which could be a FAX machine, a printer, a system for displaying images (such as video) or a machine capable of processing and playing audio files, such as a voice mail system. The present invention includes the ability to redirect certain message attachments to such an external machine 30 if the redirector program configuration data reflects that the mobile device 24 cannot receive and process the attachments, or if the user has specified that certain attachments are not to be forwarded to mobile device 24, even if such device can process those attachments. By way of example, consider an E-mail sent to a user that includes three attachments--a word processing document, a video clip and an audio clip. The redirection program could be configured to send the text of the E-mail to the remote device, to send the word processing document to a networked printer located near the user, to send the video clip to a store accessible through a secure connection through the internet and to send the audio clip to the user's voice mail system. This example is not intended to limit the breadth and scope of the invention, but rather to illustrate the variety of possibilities embodied in the redirection concept.

This section of LAZARIDIS et al. discloses redirecting certain message attachments to an external machine 30 if the redirector program configuration data reflects that the mobile device 24 cannot receive and process the attachments, or if the user has specified that certain attachments are not to be forwarded to mobile device 24, even if such device can process those attachments. This section of LAZARIDIS et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving, at the server, a selection, made by the user, of another one of the communication devices for which notifications are to be transmitted to the preferred communication device, as required by amended claim 1.

At column 12, lines 17-31, LAZARIDIS et al. discloses:

FIG. 4 sets forth the basic steps of the redirector program 12 assuming it is operating at a desktop system 10, such as shown in FIG. 1. If the redirector 12 is operating at a network server 11, as shown in FIG. 2, then additional configuration steps may be necessary to enable redirection for a particular desktop system 10, 26, 28 connected to the server, including: (1) setting up a profile for the desktop system indicating its address, events that will trigger redirection, and the data items that are to be redirected upon detecting an event; (2) maintaining a storage area at the server for the data items; and (3) storing the type of data communication device to which the desktop system's data items are to be redirected, whether and what type of attachments the device is capable of receiving and processing, and the address of the mobile device.

This section of LAZARIDIS et al. discloses additional configuration steps that may be necessary to enable redirection for a particular desktop system connected to a server if the redirector is operating at the server. The steps include setting up a profile for the desktop system, maintaining a storage area at the server for data items, and storing the type of data communication device to which the desktop system's data items are to be redirected. This section of LAZARIDIS et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving, at the server, a selection, made by the user, of another one of the communication devices for which notifications are to be transmitted to the preferred communication device, as required by amended claim 1.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by LAZARIDIS et al.

Claims 2-4 and 6-9 depend from claim 1. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by LAZARIDIS et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Amended independent claim 10 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 10 is not anticipated by LAZARIDIS et al. for reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claims 11 and 12 depend from claim 10. Therefore, these claims are not anticipated by LAZARIDIS et al. for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Claims 13 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly anticipated by SAYLOR et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Independent claim 13 recites a method for providing a notification to a preferred communication device of a plurality of communication devices associated with a user. The method includes receiving, at a network device, information from a non-preferred one of the communication devices indicating a call has been received at the non-preferred communication device and identifying the preferred communication device; generating a notification corresponding to the received information; and transmitting the notification from the network device to the identified preferred device. SAYLOR et al. does not disclose or suggest this combination of features.

For example, SAYLOR et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving information from a non-preferred one of a plurality of communication devices indicating a call has been received at the non-preferred communication device and identifying a preferred communication device. The Examiner relies on column 5, lines 17-30 and column 6, line 56 – column 7, line 15 of SAYLOR et al. as allegedly disclosing these features (Office Action, pg. 4). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's interpretation of SAYLOR et al.

At column 5, lines 17-30, SAYLOR et al. discloses:

According to an embodiment of the present invention, security devices may be predominantly wireless and communicate locally over short-range radio or other modes of communication. Each of the sensors (or group of sensors) may be equipped with a transmitter and the control panel may be equipped with a receiver. A control panel of the present invention may receive regular status information from the sensors and may be alerted when a sensor detects an alarm situation. Other information may be received by

the control panel. Transmission of regular status information may occur at predetermined intervals, as well. For example, the sensors may send digital data packets providing status and other data at 10 second intervals. Also, on or off status information may be conveyed to central security network 130.

This section of SAYLOR et al. discloses that a control panel may receive regular status information from a sensor or a group of sensors and may be alerted when a sensor detects an alarm situation. This section of SAYLOR et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving information from a non-preferred one of a plurality of communication devices indicating a call has been received at the non-preferred communication device and identifying a preferred communication device, as required by claim 13.

At column 6, line 56 – column 7, line 15, SAYLOR et al. discloses:

Central security network 130 may process the alarm situation. User profile information may be retrieved from user database 140. User database 140 may contain user information, such as profile information, user preferences, contact information, special instructions and/or other information. User profile information may include one or more of name, identification information, address information, and other profile information. User preferences may include mode of communication, order of communication, contact information and other preferences. User preference information may be associated with each security device, group of devices, systems or other combinations. For example, different alarm situations that may be detected in various locations or systems may warrant different levels of response. In addition, a user may maintain a personal address book where contact information (e.g., phone, pager, mobile device, etc.) associated with various individuals may be stored and accessed based on various identified alarm situations and/or potential alarm situations. Special instructions may include information to be conveyed to entities reacting to the alarm for a particular location or object. For example, when a fire detector is activated, the user may want to inform the fire department that the user has two pets living at the user's primary residence. Other instructions for different registered locations, objects and/or individuals may be stored and conveyed to entities reacting to the alarm situation per the user's instructions or preferences.

This section of SAYLOR et al. discloses that central security network 130 may process an alarm situation and user profile information may be retrieved from user database 140. This section of SAYLOR et al. does not disclose or suggest receiving information from a non-preferred one of a

plurality of communication devices indicating a call has been received at the non-preferred communication device and identifying a preferred communication device, as required by claim 13.

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that claim 13 is not anticipated by SAYLOR et al.

Independent claim 14 recites features similar to, yet possibly of different scope than, features recited above with respect to claim 13. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 14 is not anticipated by SAYLOR et al. for reasons similar to the reasons given above with respect to claim 13.

Claims 4 and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over LAZARIDIS et al. in view of LEE et al. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 4 depends from claim 1. Without acquiescing in the rejection of claim 4, Applicants submit that the disclosure of LEE et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of LAZARIDIS et al. set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 4 is patentable over LAZARIDIS et al. and LEE et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

Claim 12 depends from claim 10. Without acquiescing in the rejection of claim 12, Applicants submit that the disclosure of LEE et al. does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of LAZARIDIS et al. set forth above with respect to claim 10. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 12 is patentable over LAZARIDIS et al. and LEE et al., whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 10.

Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over LAZARIDIS et al. in view of SKIDMORE. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 9 depends from claim 1. Without acquiescing in the rejection of claim 9, Applicants submit that the disclosure of SKIDMORE does not remedy the deficiencies in the disclosure of LAZARIDIS et al. set forth above with respect to claim 1. Therefore, Applicants submit that claim 9 is patentable over LAZARIDIS et al. and SKIDMORE, whether taken alone or in any reasonable combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner's reconsideration of this application, and the timely allowance of the pending claims. While the present application is now believed to be in condition for allowance, should the Examiner find that some issue remains unresolved, or should any new issues arise which could be eliminated through discussions with Applicant's representative, then the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to expedite prosecution of this application.



To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-1070 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

HARRITY SNYDER, L.L.P.

By: Meagan S. Walling/  
Meagan S. Walling  
Registration No. 60,112

Date: April 9, 2007

11350 Random Hills Road  
Suite 600  
Fairfax, Virginia 22030  
(571) 432-0800

Customer Number: 25537